



Limited Visual Dam Safety Inspection Summary Report

HI - 00123

Puu Pulehu Reservoir

Hawaii, Hawaii

Prepared by:

**U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS
HONOLULU ENGINEER DISTRICT**

**STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF LAND AND NATURAL RESOURCES**

May 2006

Limited Visual Dam Safety Inspection Conducted on: 6 April 2006

I. Purpose:

Due to disaster occurrences of periodic heavy rains and flooding, which has caused extensive damage to property and loss of lives, the Governor has issued a State of Emergency Proclamation extending from February 20, 2006 to April 9, 2006. In light of the tragic failure of the Kaloko dam on Kauai and the continued forecast of heavy rains, emergency inspections of all regulated dams in all counties are being undertaken.

These inspections are for the purpose of determining if any of the regulated dams and reservoirs in the City and County of Honolulu, Maui County or Hawaii County, are suspect for immediate concern to the downstream area under the prolonged conditions of heavy rain showers.

II. Authority

Inspections were authorized under the Hawaii Dam Safety Act of 1987, Chapter 179D "Dams and Reservoirs" of Hawaii Revised Statutes, and Title 13, Subtitle 7, Chapter 190, "Dams and Reservoirs" of the Hawaii Administrative Rules.

These inspections were conducted under joint agreements of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (ACE), the U.S. Department of Agriculture Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), and the State of Hawaii. The Memorandum of Agreement with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is entered into pursuant to 10 U.S.C. § 3036(d)(2), and the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act (31 U.S.C. §6505), and established via support agreement number DL-06-01.

III. Scope

Visual inspection was performed on parts of the embankment and appurtenant works readily available and visible for inspection by the inspection team at the time of the inspection. Such parts and appurtenant works included the upstream slope, crest, downstream slope, abutments and toes, outlet works, and spillway.

On the date of this limited visual inspection, there may or may not have appeared to be any immediate threat to the safety of the dam, however no assurance can be made regarding the dam's condition after this date. Subsequent adverse weather and other factors may affect the dam's condition.

IV. Limitations of Findings and Recommendations

The inspection is based only on visible features/areas of the dam on the day of inspection. The inspection does not entail detailed stability, hydrologic, hydraulic, or seismic investigations. This inspection is not a formal phase I or phase II dam safety inspection and does not include a review or evaluation from each specialist of an inspection team, such as a geologists, civil, geotechnical, structural, or hydraulics engineer. The owner should verify the findings of this report and take corrective actions. The owner may submit to the State alternative corrective actions that are certified by a licensed professional engineer in the State of Hawaii experienced in the design and construction of dams. This inspection does not relieve the owner/operator from their responsibility to conduct routine inspections, maintenance, repairs, modifications, monitoring, documentation, and/or investigative studies.

V. Inspection Team

Organization

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
 State of Hawaii, Dept. of Land and Natural Resources
 National Resources Conservation Service

Name

Joseph P. Koester
 Eric Tanaka
 Drew Stout

VI. Owner's Representatives Present

Ernest Alfonso, State of Hawaii, Dept. of Agriculture

VII. Inspection Team

Organization

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

 State of Hawaii, Dept. of Land and Natural Resources

Name

Derek Chow
 Joseph Koester
 Denise Manuel
 Edwin Matsuda

VIII. Dam Type

The dam is an earthen embankment.

IX. Dam Classification

The current hazard classification of this dam is: High
 Based on available data, this classification is believed to still be applicable.

Hazard Potential Classification based on the following:

Category	Loss of Life	Economic Loss
Low	None Expected	Minimal (undeveloped to occasional structures or agriculture)
Significant	Few (No Urban development and no more than a small number of inhabitable structures)	Appreciable (Notable agriculture, industry or structures)
High	More than a few	Extensive community, industry or agriculture.

Based on inventoried storage and height data, the size classification of the dam is: Small

Size Classification based on the following:

Category	Storage (Acre-Feet)	Height (feet)
Small	< 1000	< 40
Intermediate	> 1000 and < 50,000	> 40 and < 100
Large	> 50,000	> 100

X. Summary of Inspection:

Condition Rating Criteria: The conditional terms in this report are used to generally described the conditions below. Inspections, monitoring, and additional investigations are considered to be incidental to all condition ratings.

Satisfactory	Expected to fulfill intended function.
Fair	Expected to fulfill intended function, but maintenance is recommended.
Poor	May not fulfill intended function; maintenance or repairs are necessary.
Unsatisfactory	Is not expected to fulfill intended function; repair, replacement, or modification is necessary.
Unknown	Not visible, not accessible, not inspected, or unable to determine the condition rating based on the observation taken.

A. General appearance:

The reservoir and dam features were easily recognizable; the facility consists of a pair of 60 million gallon ponds that are lined with 80 mil HDPE. The dam appears to have little drainage area and is used for irrigation.

Modifications / Improvements: There were no signs of any recent modifications. The reservoir appeared to have a small surface drainage area. Based on staff personnel, this reservoir is not subject to flash flood conditions. The dam is routinely inspected and maintained.

Based on staff personnel, this reservoir has no incident history.

Findings and Corrective Actions:

- a. The Owner shall maintain documentations including Construction plans, specifications, improvements, modifications, Operations and Maintenance Manuals and routine inspection logs for this dam facility.
- b. An EAP is required for High Hazard Dams. Submit an updated EAP for this facility.
- c. An EAP is recommended for all dams regardless of hazard class. Submit EAP if developed for the facility.
- d. Routine inspection logs were not inspected, although the owner representative reported their existence.
- e. Dam owners shall provide for routine inspection of the dam.
- f. Access to site appears to be satisfactory.
- g. Emergency Alarms / Monitors: There were no alarms or monitors observed on this reservoir.
- h. Power / Communication: There were no communication systems observed on this reservoir. There were no utility or power poles visible nearby.

B. Access / Security:

Access to the dam was accomplished via a County roadway. A four wheel drive vehicle is not required. Any security issues: Valves are locked. Access to the dam is via several locked gates.

C. Inflow Works:

A single, 8 ft wide, 4 ft deep rectangular concrete inlet channel feeds the reservoir. According to the owner representative on site, the intake or inlets have the ability to be shut off or diverted away from the reservoir during periods of heavy rains. This is done manually.

Findings and Corrective Actions:

- a. The intake works were not tested.
- b. The intake works appeared to be in satisfactory condition, except that vegetation and debris should be cleared from the intake opening adjacent to the upper pond.

D. Reservoir

The reservoir level during the inspection was 30 ft deep, as indicated on gage markings on the liner. According to staff personnel, the reservoir is normally operated at this level. Typically the spillway is always flowing. No sinkholes or depressions were observed.

Findings and Corrective Actions:

- a. The reservoir appeared to be in satisfactory condition, no corrective actions are required at this time.

E. Upstream Slope (Satisfactory)

The upstream slope was approximately 3H: 1V (Horizontal / Vertical). The slope was protected by an 80 mil HDPE liner in excellent condition. No cracks or sinkholes were observed.

Findings and Corrective Actions:

- a. The upstream slope appeared to be in satisfactory condition, no corrective actions are required at this time.

F. Crest: (Satisfactory)

The dam crest was approximately 8-10 feet wide. There was a dirt access road on top of the crest that appeared to be well utilized. There was good turf vegetation on and along either edge of the crest. Cracks were not observed, nor were sinkholes or erosion.

Findings and Corrective Actions:

- a. The dam crest appeared to be in satisfactory condition, no corrective actions are required at this time.
- b. Access along the crest was satisfactory.

G. Downstream Slope: (Satisfactory)

The downstream slope was in good condition, except for the presence of a cluster of 5-6 ironwood trees growing on the west side of the upper of the twin ponds. These are substantial (6 inch to 12 inch diameter). The slope was appropriate, around a 3H to 1V slope. There was no vehicle access to the downstream slope. There was no slope protection observed on the downstream slope. No erosion, sinkholes or cracks were observed on the downstream slope. Vegetation was observed on the downstream slope. The majority of the vegetation was grass, except for the aforementioned trees. Seepage was not observed on the downstream toe.

Findings and Corrective Actions:

- a. The downstream slope appeared to be in satisfactory condition, no corrective actions are required at this time.
- b. Tree(s) were observed on the downstream slope. Trees have been identified as the probably cause of piping failures, and can possibly cause severe damage to the embankment if they are uprooted during a high winds. Corrective action is required to remove the tree hazards from the dam. Acceptable remedies include removal of the tree and its root structure down to a 2" diameter and reconstructing the damaged embankment section. All repair work shall be accomplished as per the requirements of licensed geotechnical or structural engineer. Routinely monitor the damaged area for signs of settlement and seepage.

H. Abutments / Toe: (Satisfactory)

No erosion, cracks, vegetation or seepage were observed along the abutment or toe.

Findings and Corrective Actions:

- a. The abutments/toe appeared to be in satisfactory condition, no corrective actions are required at this time.

I. Outlet Works: (Satisfactory)

Not inspected in detail, not tested. According to previous inspection reports, the outlet is a valve-controlled ductile iron pipe of unknown dimension. The outlet works was controlled via a gate valve on the upstream side of the dam.

Seepage was not observed flowing near the exit of the outlet works.

Findings and Corrective Actions:

- a. The outlet works were not inspected.
- b. The outlet works appeared to be in satisfactory condition, no corrective actions are required at this time.

J. Spillway: (Fair)

This spillway consisted of a low spot in the reservoir rim, leading to a roughly trapezoidal cut channel in natural ground. Dimensions are irregular, with an average width of 12 ft.

The spillway channel proceeds in a right bend of about 50 ft radius for about 200 ft to a concrete lined channel, then feeds natural overland drainage swale away from the dam.

The spillway approach was not well-engineered; overflow proceeds across an unsupported section of liner, then for about 20 ft across unprotected, highly erodable soil to the cut channel. The downstream vegetation appears to be primarily low ground cover vegetation.

Findings and Corrective Actions:

- a. The Spillway appeared to be in fair to poor condition and requires corrective action.
- b. Slope protection needs maintenance or repair. Description: **Recommend construction of a concrete apron to cover unprotected soil from the liner to the cut channel. Liner should also be supported in the low area of the rim that serves as a spillway lip, in order to avoid distress to the liner during high flow periods.**

K. Down Stream Channel: (Satisfactory)

There is a well-defined downstream channel.

Findings and Corrective Actions:

- a. The downstream channel appeared to be in satisfactory condition, no corrective actions are required at this time.

XI. Additional Comments:

Chain link exclusion fencing is in disrepair.

Along much of the fence, unvegetated soil has eroded by rainfall from beneath the fence and the base of many posts, undermining their support (see photos). Smaller animals may access the reservoir beneath the fence in these areas. Steep, smoothly lined slopes inside the reservoir present a drowning hazard to any person or animal that falls in.

Original field inspection notes were scanned and are attached to this summary report. Included are several photos from the site visit to detail important features of the project, captioned to be self-explanatory.

Per e-mail dated 5/1/2006 12:57 pm from Joe Koester, USACE

Reservoir:

Normal Operating Level/Range **Full, at 30 ft depth as observed at the time of the inspection**

It does not state the range. i.e., 20 to 30 feet **The reservoir is maintained at full, spilling flow downstream.**

Dam ID: <u>HI00123</u>
Name: <u>Puu Pulehu Reservoir</u>

Was a staff gage observed at the time of inspection. If yes, where. If no, please provide corrective action. **Gage information was taken from markings on the liner. No corrective action recommended.**

Upstream slope:

Please provide information on erosion, cracks, sinkholes and seepage. **The upstream slope is completely lined and showed no distress.**

Outlet works:

Please indicate seepage, if observed. **No seepage observed**

Spillway:

Please indicate spillway approach. **Spillway approach clear.**

Downstream channel:

Indicate downstream. **Downstream channel was an existing stream or drainage-way.**

Indicate items along the stream bank. **There may be residences along the stream bank; the downstream channel was not walked beyond the site view.**

Comments:

Was there an immediate threat to the safety of the dam at the time of inspection? **There were no immediate threats to the safety of the dam observed at the time of inspection.**

PHOTOGRAPHS

Dam ID: HA-123

Name: Puu Pulehu Reservoir



Aerial view of Puu Pulehu
Reservoir system (HA-123)



Inflow structure (8 ft by 4 ft
concrete channel), viewed from
reservoir (HA-123)

Dam ID: HA-123

Name: Puu Pulehu Reservoir



View of typical shoreline, showing 80 mil HDPE liner, poorly vegetated soil, crest road, and exclusion fence (HA-123)



View of erosion at base of exclusion fence and loss of post support (HA-123)

Dam ID: HA-123

Name: Puu Pulehu Reservoir



Dam ID: HA-123

Name: Puu Pulehu Reservoir



FIELD INSPECTION SHEETS

Dam ID: HA-0123
PUU PULEHU RESERVOIR

Vulnerability Index:
Extreme High Moderate Low
1 2 3 4

Inspection No:

Date: 4/6/86

STATE OF HAWAII - DLNR
DAM SAFETY INSPECTION SHEET

Inspection Type: Visual Dam Safety Inspection

Persons Present

Affiliation

Phone Number

JOE KOESTER	US Army Corps of Engineers	
DREW STOUT	NRCS	
ERIC TANAKA	DLNR	
ERNEST ALFONSO	DOA	

Weather Condition: ☐ Rain previous day ☐ Rainy ☒ Drizzle / Mist ☐ Cloudy/Overcast ☐ Partly Cloudy ☐ Sunny ☐ Dry

Comments:

1. General: (Information currently on file, update as required)

Dam/Res. Name PUU PULEHU RESERVOIR
Owner State of Hawaii, Department of Agriculture (DHHL is fee owner) (C027)
Owner Contact Mr. Brian Kau Owner Ph. _____
Lessee N/A Lessee Ph. _____
O & M Contractor Department of Agriculture O & M Ph. _____
Nearest Town KUKUIHAELE Latitude 20.04 ° (decimal)
County HAWAII Longitude 155.6017 ° (decimal)
Tax Map Key(s) (3)6-4-003:015

Dam Status	A:	Hazard Potential	H:	Dam Size	
Year Completed	1910	Dam Length	400 ft.	Dam Height	21 ft.
Normal Storage	100 ac.ft.	Max. Storage	315 ac.ft.	Max. Surface Area	17 ac.
Drainage Area	mi.	Spillway Type		Max. Spillway Q	93 cfs

Owner owns land under dam facility:

Emergency Action Plan on file with the Department: NO

Reports on file with the Department:

Sept. 1997 = Dam Safety Inspection, RM Towill Corp. (3)

Aug. 1993 = Flood Study, Okimoto (1)

March 1979 = Army Corps of Engineers, Initial Dam Safety Inspection / Survey (3)

2. Questions for Owner's Rep.: Yes No Unknown Comments

Construction Plans Available	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Site / Facility Map	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Operation & Maintenance Manual	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Emergency Action Plan	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Modifications / Improvements	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Conduct Routine Inspections	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Conduct Routine Maintenance	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Vehicle access to site	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Not accessible <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> With Standard car <input type="checkbox"/> Requires 4-Wheel Drive
Access during heavy rains	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Not accessible <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> With Standard car <input type="checkbox"/> Requires 4-Wheel Drive
Access when spillway is flowing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Not accessible <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> With Standard car <input type="checkbox"/> Requires 4-Wheel Drive
Other Studies Conducted	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Phase I <input type="checkbox"/> Phase II <input type="checkbox"/> Hydraulics <input type="checkbox"/> Stability <input type="checkbox"/> Hazard <input type="checkbox"/> Seismic <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____
Incident History	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Breached <input type="checkbox"/> Overtop <input type="checkbox"/> Slide <input type="checkbox"/> Down stream Flooding <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____
Reservoir's Current Use	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Sediment <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Irrigation <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation <input type="checkbox"/> Flood Control <input type="checkbox"/> Drinking Water <input type="checkbox"/> Power Generation <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

Findings and Corrective Actions:

- ☒ a. The Owner shall maintain documentations including Construction plans, specifications, improvements, modifications, Operations and Maintenance Manuals and routine inspection logs for this dam facility.
- ☐ b. An Emergency Action Plan (EAP) is on file with the department, submit any updates as applicable.
- ☒ c. An EAP is required for High Hazard Dams. Submit an updated EAP for this facility.
- ☐ d. An EAP is recommended for all dams regardless of hazard class. Submit EAP if developed for the facility.
- ☐ e. Submit narrative and additional information detailing the improvements, modifications, and/or alterations at the dam site, unless covered by approved dam permit.
- ☐ f. Routine inspection logs were not inspected.
- ☒ g. Dam owners shall provide for routine inspection of the dam.
- ☐ h. The dam did not appear to be maintained on a regular basis.
- ☒ i. Access to site appears to be satisfactory.
- ☐ j. There is no vehicular access to the dam site. Operational and emergency plans need to reflect this deficiency or access provided.
- ☐ k. Access to dam is questionable during severe weather conditions and/or spillway overflows. Operational plans and emergency plans need to reflect this deficiency or access provided.
- ☐ l. Provide a detailed narrative of the incident, responses taken, and any damages incurred. Dam owners are required to promptly advise the department of any sudden or unprecedented flood or unusual or alarming circumstance or occurrences which may adversely affect the dam or reservoir.
- ☐ m. Submit current Operations and Maintenance Manual or Procedures for this dam / reservoir facility.
- ☐ n. Submit Site or Facility Map of this Dam which identifies the location of major features including outlet works controls and conduits.
- ☐ o. _____

Additional Requirements:

The following investigative study(s) are:

Required	Recommended	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Phase I Study
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Phase II Study (Including <input type="checkbox"/> Seepage <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Hydraulics <input type="checkbox"/> EAP)
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Hydrology and Hydraulics (including Probable Maximum Flood and spillway capacity)
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Stability Analysis
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Seismic Analysis
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Hazard Classification
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other: _____

Dam ID: HA-0123
PUU PULEHU RESERVOIR

Inspection No: _____
Date: 4/6/06

Physical Dam Features: (Check All Applicable. Provide description of Items Observed and/or Take Photos. Indicate photo # in description.)

TWIN; 60MG LINED POND, CONNECTED AT LOW SPT

3. Reservoir:

Level during inspection 30 DEEP ft per _____ (gage / other)

Normal Operating Level/Range " ft per _____ (gage / other)

Description: _____

Typical Operation ☐ Spillway always flowing ☒ Kept within normal range ☐ Kept Empty ☐ Drained Daily ☐ Only filled by Storms

☐ Other: _____

Sinkhole in Res.: ☐ # Observed: _____ Size: _____ by _____ in. Deep ☐ Not Visible ☒ None Observed

Description: _____

Staff Gage: Description: _____

Findings:

- ☐ a. The reservoir was not inspected.
- ☒ b. The reservoir appeared to be in satisfactory condition, no corrective actions are required at this time.
- ☐ c. The reservoir appeared to be in fair to poor condition and requires corrective action.
- ☐ d. The reservoir appeared to be in unsatisfactory condition, urgent corrective action is required.

Corrective Actions:

- ☐ e. The staff gage needs maintenance and/or repair. Description: _____
- ☐ f. A staff gage was not observed at the reservoir. Provide some method of quantifying the water level within the reservoir.
- ☐ g. A sinkhole was observed in the upstream reservoir. Conduct additional investigations and monitoring to identify the cause, risk and appropriate action.
- ☐ h. _____

4. Intake Works Description:

☐ Number of Intakes 1

☐ Intake Culvert / Pipe

Size: _____ in. ☐ DIP ☐ Corrugated Metal ☐ PVC ☐ HDPE ☐ Concrete ☐ Other _____

Control: ☐ Gate ☐ Valve ☐ Flow can either be Shut off or Bypassed

From: ☐ Stream Diversion ☐ Pump ☐ Reservoir ☐ Other _____

☒ Ditch / Flume

Dimension: 8' x 4' DEEP (Size x Depth) Shape Rectangular

Surface: ☐ Dirt ☐ Wood ☒ Concrete ☐ Lined w/ _____

Control: ☐ Gate ☐ Valve ☐ Flow can either be Shut off or Bypassed UNKNOWN

From: ☒ Stream Diversion ☐ Pump ☐ Reservoir ☐ Other _____

Findings:

- ☐ a. The intake works were not inspected.
- ☒ b. The intake works were not tested.
- ☒ c. The intake works appeared to be in satisfactory condition, no corrective actions are required at this time.
- ☐ d. The intake works appeared to be in fair to poor condition and requires corrective action.
- ☐ e. The intake works appeared to be in unsatisfactory condition, urgent corrective action is required.

Corrective Actions:

- ☒ f. The intake works needs maintenance and/or repair. Description: CIPRAAL PARTLY CHOKED WITH VEGETATION
- ☐ g. AND DEBRIS

Dam ID: HA-0123
PUU PULEHU RESERVOIR

Inspection No: _____
Date: 4/6/06

5. Upstream Slope:

(Typical Slope \pm 3H : 1V)

Slope Protection: ☐ None ☐ Dumped Rock ☐ Fitted Rip Rap ☐ Grouted Rip Rap ☒ Liner 86 mil HDPE ☐ Other: _____

☐ Defect in Protection: Description: _____

Erosion: ☐ Loose soil w/ little vegetation ☐ Rut (<6") ☐ Gully (>6" deep) ☐ Not Visible ☒ None Observed

Description: _____

Cracks: ☐ Parallel with crest ☐ Perpendicular to crest ☐ Slide visible ☐ Not Visible ☒ None Observed

Description: _____

Sinkholes: ☐ # Observed: _____ Size: _____ and _____ Depth ☐ Not Visible ☒ None Observed

Description: _____

Vegetation: ☒ None ☐ Low Ground Cover ☐ Bushes or Tall Grass ☐ Trees # _____ ☐ <6" ☐ >6" & <20" ☐ >20"

Description: _____

Findings:

- ☐ a. The upstream slope was not inspected.
- ☒ b. The upstream slope appeared to be in satisfactory condition, no corrective actions are required at this time.
- ☐ c. The upstream slope appeared to be in fair to poor condition and requires corrective action.
- ☐ d. The upstream slope appeared to be in unsatisfactory condition and not expected to fulfill its intended function. Urgent corrective action is required.

Corrective Actions:

- ☐ e. Slope protection needs maintenance or repair. Description: _____
- ☐ f. Rut and/or Gully erosion was observed on the slope, which requires maintenance and/or repair. Description: _____
- ☐ g. A crack was observed on the slope, which requires further investigation to determine the underlining cause. Monitor the area and/or repair as required.
- ☐ h. A sinkhole was observed on the slope, which requires further investigation to determine the underlining cause. Repair and monitor the area.
- ☐ i. The upstream slope was not visible due to high grass and bush vegetation. Clear high vegetation and maintain low to enable easy visual inspection.
- ☐ j. Tree(s) were observed on the dam embankment. Trees have been identified as the probably cause of piping failures, and can possibly cause sever damage to the embankment if they are uprooted during a high winds. Corrective action is required to remove the tree hazards from the dam. Acceptable remedies include removal of the tree and its root structure down to a 2" diameter and reconstructing the damaged embankment section. All repair work shall be accomplished as per the requirements of licensed geotechnical or structural engineer. Routinely monitor the damaged area for signs of settlement and seepage.
- ☐ k. _____

6. Crest:

Approximate Crest Width: 8-10'

Access: ☐ None ☐ Walking Path ☒ Roadway, Surface / Width / Usage: _____

Erosion: ☐ Loose soil w/ little vegetation ☐ Rut (<6") ☐ Gully (>6" deep) ☐ Not Visible ☒ None Observed

Description: _____

Cracks: ☐ Parallel with crest ☐ Perpendicular to crest ☐ Slide visible ☐ Not Visible ☒ None Observed

Description: _____

Sinkholes: ☐ _____ in. Wide x _____ in. Long x _____ in. Deep ☐ Not Visible ☒ None Observed

Description: _____

Vegetation: ☐ None ☒ Low Ground Cover ☐ Bushes or Tall Grass ☐ Trees # _____ ☐ <6" ☐ >6" & <20" ☐ >20"

Description: Trees

Findings:

- ☐ a. The dam crest was not inspected.
- ☒ b. The dam crest appeared to be in satisfactory condition, no corrective actions are required at this time.
- ☐ c. The dam crest appeared to be in fair to poor condition and requires corrective action.
- ☐ d. The dam crest appeared to be in unsatisfactory condition and not expected to fulfill its intended function. Urgent corrective action is required.

Corrective Actions:

- ☒ e. Access along the crest was satisfactory.
- ☐ f. Access along the crest was not possible. Description: _____
- ☐ g. Rut and/or Gully erosion was observed on the crest, which requires maintenance and/or repair. Description: _____
- ☐ h. A crack was observed on the crest, which requires further investigation to determine the underlining cause. Monitor the area and/or repair as required.
- ☐ i. A sinkhole was observed on the crest, which requires further investigation to determine the underlining cause. Repair and monitor the area.
- ☐ j. Portions of the crest were not visible due to high grass and bush vegetation. Clear high vegetation and maintain low to enable easy visual inspection.
- ☐ k. Tree(s) were observed along the dam crest. Trees have been identified as the probably cause of piping failures, and can possibly cause sever damage to the embankment if they are uprooted during a high winds. Corrective action is required to remove the tree hazards from the dam. Acceptable remedies include removal of the tree and its root structure down to a 2" diameter and reconstructing the damaged embankment section. All repair work shall be accomplished as per the requirements of licensed geotechnical or structural engineer. Routinely monitor the damaged area for signs of settlement and seepage.
- ☐ l. _____

7. Downstream Slope:

(Typical Slope \pm 3H: 1V)

Access: ☐ lower roadway along toe ☐ roadway to outlet works ☐ walkway to outlet works ☒ None Observed

Slope Protection: ☒ None ☐ Dumped Rock ☐ Rip Rap ☐ Grouted Rip Rap ☐ Concrete

Erosion: ☐ Loose soil w/ little vegetation ☐ Rut (<6") ☐ Gully (>6" deep) ☐ Not Visible ☐ None Observed

Description: _____

Cracks: ☐ Parallel with crest ☐ Perpendicular to crest ☐ Slide visible ☐ Not Visible ☐ None Observed

Description: _____

Sinkholes: ☐ _____ in. Wide x _____ in. Long x _____ in. Deep ☐ Not Visible ☐ None Observed

Description: _____

Vegetation: ☐ None ☒ Low Ground Cover ☒ Bushes or Tall Grass ☒ Trees # _____ ☐ <6" ☒ >6" & <20" ☐ >20"

Description: DOWNED TREES, WEST SIDE OF UPPER POND, CLUSTER OF 5 OR 6

Seepage: Seep Spot Number 1

☐ Green Vegetation ☐ Wet or Muddy Ground ☐ Ponding Water ☐ Not Visible ☐ None Observed

☐ Flowing, Description: _____

Water Clarity: ☐ Clear ☐ Some particles ☐ Muddy ☐ Other: _____

Description: _____

Seep Spot Number 2

☐ Green Vegetation ☐ Wet or Muddy Ground ☐ Ponding Water ☐ Not Visible ☐ None Observed

☐ Flowing, Description: _____

Water Clarity: ☐ Clear ☐ Some particles ☐ Muddy ☐ Other: _____

Description: _____

Findings:

- ☒ a. The downstream slope was not inspected.
- ☒ b. The downstream slope appeared to be in satisfactory condition, no corrective actions are required at this time.
- ☐ c. The downstream slope appeared to be in fair to poor condition and requires corrective action.
- ☐ d. The downstream slope appeared to be in unsatisfactory condition and not expected to fulfill its intended function. Urgent corrective action is required.

Corrective Actions:

- ☐ e. Slope protection needs maintenance or repair. Description: _____
- ☐ f. Rut and/or Gully erosion was observed on the slope, which requires maintenance and/or repair. Description: _____
- ☐ g. A crack was observed on the slope, which requires further investigation to determine the underlining cause. Monitor the area and/or repair as required.
- ☐ h. A sinkhole was observed on the slope, which requires further investigation to determine the underlining cause. Repair and monitor the area.
- ☐ i. The down stream slope was not visible due to high grass and bush vegetation. Clear high vegetation and maintain low to enable easy visual inspection.
- ☒ g. Tree(s) were observed on the downstream slope. Trees have been identified as the probably cause of piping failures, and can possibly cause sever damage to the embankment if they are uprooted during a high winds. Corrective action is required to remove the tree hazards from the dam. Acceptable remedies include removal of the tree and its root structure down to a 2" diameter and reconstructing the damaged embankment section. All repair work shall be accomplished as per the requirements of licensed geotechnical or structural engineer. Routinely monitor the damaged area for signs of settlement and seepage.
- ☐ h. Seepage/Ponding water was observed. Monitor and conduct further investigation to locate the source of water and extent of any possible hazardous or developing condition.
- ☐ i. Seepage was observed flowing and particles were observed to be removed by the flow. Take immediate action to stop the loss of soil from the embankment. Conduct further investigation to determine the underlining cause and take corrective action. Monitor the area.
- ☐ j. The slope was very steep, around a 1 to 1 slope, further study is required to verify slope stability.
- ☐ k. _____

8. Abutments/Toe:

Erosion: ☐ Loose soil w/ little vegetation ☐ Rut (<6") ☐ Gully (>6" deep) ☐ Not Visible ☒ None Observed
Description: _____

Cracks: ☐ Parallel with crest ☐ Perpendicular to crest ☐ Slide visible ☐ Not Visible ☒ None Observed
Description: _____

Vegetation: ☐ None ☒ Low Ground Cover ☒ Bushes or Tall Grass ☐ Trees # _____ ☐ <6" ☐ >6" & <20" ☐ >20"
Description: _____

Seepage: Seep Spot Number 1
☐ Green Vegetation ☐ Wet or Muddy Ground ☐ Ponding Water ☐ Not Visible ☒ None Observed
☐ Flowing, Description: _____
Water Clarity: ☐ Clear ☐ Some particles ☐ Muddy ☐ Other: _____
Description: _____

Seep Spot Number 2
☐ Green Vegetation ☐ Wet or Muddy Ground ☐ Ponding Water ☐ Not Visible ☐ None Observed
☐ Flowing, Description: _____
Water Clarity: ☐ Clear ☐ Some particles ☐ Muddy ☐ Other: _____
Description: _____

Findings:

- ☐ a. The abutments/toe were not inspected.
- ☒ b. The abutments/toe appeared to be in satisfactory condition, no corrective actions are required at this time.
- ☐ c. The abutments/toe appeared to be in fair to poor condition and requires corrective action.
- ☐ d. The abutments/toe appeared to be in unsatisfactory condition and not expected to fulfill its intended function. Urgent corrective action is required.

Corrective Actions:

- ☐ e. Slope protection needs maintenance or repair. Description: _____
- ☐ f. Rut and/or Gully erosion was observed, which requires maintenance and/or repair.
Description: _____
- ☐ g. A crack was observed along the abutments/near the toe, which requires further investigation to determine the underlining cause. Monitor the area and/or repair as required.
- ☐ h. The abutment/toe area was not visible due to high grass and bush vegetation. Clear high vegetation and maintain low to enable easy visual inspection.
- ☐ i. Tree(s) were observed along the abutment/toe. Trees have been identified as the probably cause of piping failures, and can possibly cause sever damage to the embankment if they are uprooted during a high winds. Corrective action is required to remove the tree hazards from the dam. Acceptable remedies include removal of the tree and its root structure down to a 2" diameter and reconstructing the damaged embankment section. All repair work shall be accomplished as per the requirements of licensed geotechnical or structural engineer. Routinely monitor the damaged area for signs of settlement and seepage.
- ☐ j. Seepage/Ponding water was observed. Monitor and conduct further investigation to locate the source of water and extent of any possible hazardous or developing condition.
- ☐ k. Seepage was observed flowing and particles were observed to be removed by the flow. Take immediate action to stop the loss of soil from the embankment. Conduct further investigation to determine the underlining cause and take corrective action. Monitor the area.
- ☐ l. _____

9. Outlet Works:

Culvert / Pipe

Type / Size: size unknown

Culvert: ☐ Concrete ☐ Masonry ☐ unlined earth ☐ Other _____

Pipe: ☒ DIP ☐ Corrugated Metal ☐ PVC ☐ HDPE ☐ Concrete ☐ Other _____

Control Type: ☐ Gate ☒ Valve ☐ Other _____

Location: ☒ Control on Upstream side ☐ Control on Downstream side

Seepage: ☐ Green Vegetation ☐ Wet or Muddy Ground ☐ Ponding Water ☐ Not Visible ☐ None Observed

☐ Flowing, Description: _____

Water Clarity: ☐ Clear ☐ Some particles ☐ Muddy ☐ Other: _____

Description: _____

Findings:

- ☐ a. The outlet works were not inspected.
- ☒ b. The outlet works were not tested.
- ☒ c. The outlet works appeared to be in satisfactory condition, no corrective actions are required at this time.
- ☐ d. The outlet works appeared to be in fair to poor condition and requires corrective action.
- ☐ e. The outlet works appeared to be in unsatisfactory condition and not expected to fulfill its intended function. Urgent corrective action is required.

Corrective Actions:

- ☐ f. Seepage/Ponding water was observed. Conduct further investigation to locate the source of water and extent of any possible hazardous or developing condition.
- ☐ g. Seepage was observed flowing and particles were observed to be removed by the flow. Take immediate action to stop the loss of soil. Conduct further investigation to determine the underlining cause and take corrective action. Monitor the area. Failures caused by seepage/piping along the outlet conduit are very common and are considered to be a dangerous situation.
- ☐ h. Were not visible due to high grass and bush vegetation. Clear high vegetation and maintain low to enable easy visual inspection.
- ☐ i. _____
- ☐ j. _____

10. Spillway:

Type: ☐ None ☐ Culvert/Pipe ☒ Channel
Description: EARTH/ROCK TRAPEZOIDAL CHANNEL CUT IN NATURAL GROUND
Dimension: IRREGULAR, 12 ft. Invert elevation: _____ ft. per staff gage
Slope Protection: ☒ None ☐ Grass ☐ Dumped Rock ☐ Fitted Rip Rap ☐ Grouted Rip Rap ☐ Concrete
☐ Defect in Protection: Description: _____
Approach: ☐ Clear ☐ High Veg. ☐ Trees ☐ Other: _____
Erosion: ☐ Scour ☐ Gully ☐ Headcut ☒ Not Observed ☐ Other: _____
Description: _____
Vegetation: ☐ None ☒ Low Ground Cover ☐ Bushes or Tall Grass ☐ Trees # _____ ☐ <6" ☐ >6" & <20" ☐ >20"
Description: _____

Findings:

- ☐ a. The Spillway appeared to be in satisfactory condition, no corrective actions are required at this time.
☒ b. The Spillway appeared to be in fair to poor condition and requires corrective action.
☐ c. The Spillway appeared to be in unsatisfactory condition and not expected to fulfill its intended function. Urgent corrective action is required.

Corrective Actions:

- ☒ d. Slope protection needs maintenance or repair. Description: RECOMMEND CONCRETE LINING TO ROCK CUT
☐ e. The spillway approach was blocked. Clear approach.
☐ f. Severe scour erosion was observed which requires maintenance and/or repair.
Description: _____
☐ g. A headcut (vertical drop in channel due to erosion) was observed downstream of the spillway. Corrective action is required to prevent this problem from moving upstream.
☐ h. Trees are unacceptable in the spillway channel and approach. Take corrective action to address the woody vegetation problem and repair the damaged area.
☐ i. Unclear if spillway is adequately sized. Spillway should pass the probable maximum flood. Verify spillway capacity and take corrective action as required.
☒ j. LINER IS UNSUPPORTED AT SPILLWAY AND MAY WORSEN IF NO ACTION TAKEN AS (d), ABOVE

11. Down Stream Channel:

Name: _____
Downstream: ☐ Sump ☐ Open Area ☐ Un-Defined Drainage-way ☐ Defined Drainage-way ☐ Other _____
Items along Stream Bank: ☐ None ☐ Road ☐ Houses ☐ Town ☐ Not Inspected
Description: CUT TRAPEZOIDAL SECTION BANDS FOR 200 FT TO CONCRETE CHANNEL, THEN OVERLAND

Findings:

- ☐ a. The downstream channel was not inspected.
☒ b. The downstream channel appeared to be in satisfactory condition, no corrective actions are required at this time.
☐ c. The downstream channel appeared to be in fair to poor condition and requires corrective action.
☐ d. The downstream channel appeared to be in unsatisfactory condition and not expected to fulfill its intended function. Urgent corrective action is required.

Corrective Actions:

- ☐ e. _____

Dam ID: HA-0123
PUU PULEHU RESERVOIR

Inspection No: _____

Date: 4/6/06

Additional Comments:

On the date of this limited visual inspection, there appeared to be no immediate threat to the safety of the dam. No assurance can be made regarding the dam's condition after this date. Subsequent adverse weather and other factors may affect the dam's condition.

CHAIN LINK FENCE POST BASES ARE BECOMING EXPOSED BY EROSION OF
SOFT, DARK SOILS IN SOME AREAS IN VICINITY OF SPILLWAYS. NO THREAT
TO RESERVOIR, BUT WILL EVENTUALLY DROP EXCLUSION FENCE.

Limitations and Intent of this Dam Safety Inspection:

This Dam Safety Inspection was conducted to assess the general overall condition of the reservoir/dam, identify visible deficiencies, and recommend areas of for monitoring, additional investigative studies and corrective actions. The inspection is based only on visible features/areas of the dam on the day of inspection. This inspection is not a formal phase I or phase II dam safety inspection and does not include a review or evaluation from each specialist of an inspection team, such as a geologists, civil, geotechnical, structural, or hydraulics engineer. The owner should verify the findings of this report and take corrective actions. The owner may submit to the State alternative corrective actions that are certified by a licensed professional engineer in the State of Hawaii experienced in the design and construction of dams. This inspection does not relieve the owner/operator from their responsibility to conduct routine inspections, maintenance, repairs, modifications, monitoring, documentation, and/or investigative studies. The inspection was conducted under the authority of the Hawaii Revised Statutes Chapter 179D, and Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title 13, Chapter 190, titled "Dams and Reservoirs". Questions regarding this inspection should be forwarded to the Hawaii State Dam Safety Program; PO Box 373; Honolulu, Hawaii 96809; Ph. (808) 587-0236.

Revised: Dec. 1, 2003